

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-28 were rejected. By virtue of this response, claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended, and claims 29-45 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-45 are currently under consideration.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 17 are objected to due to informalities. Amendments have been made for clarification and to correct a grammatical error. Accordingly no new matter has been added. Applicants request that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-2, 4, 10-15, 17-18, 20 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powers et al. (US No.: 6,832,086 B1), hereinafter “Powers” in view of Teague (Pub. No.: US 2003/0229717 A1) and further in view of MeLampy et al. (US 7,002,973 B2), hereinafter “MeLampy”.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner cites Powers in view of Teague and further in view of MeLampy. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of the present invention and the references cited.

First, the Examiner cites Teague for disclosing “decrementing a second count value associated with the selected table entry of the plurality of table entries in response to the event identification failing to match an event identification associated with the selected table entry” as recited by amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

Applicant submits, however, that the Examiner is ignoring the claim feature of “in response to the event identification failing to match an event identification associated with the selected table entry.” Teague discloses merely that a second part of an action “decrements the

counter after a message has been accepted.” (Teague, paragraph 0063). Thus, Teague discloses decrementing a counter, but Teague neither discloses nor suggests decrementing a count value associated with the selected table entry “in response to the event identification failing to match an event identification associated with the selected table entry,” as recited by claim 1.

Furthermore, in contrast to the recited features of claim 1, Teague “decrements the counter after a message has been accepted,” regardless of any event identification (Teague, paragraph 0063, emphasis added). Teague does not disclose or suggest the use of event identification, nor does Teague disclose or suggest comparing event identifications to determine whether to decrement a counter.

Second, the Examiner cites MeLampy for disclosing “replacing the selected table entry with the event identification associated with the received event in response to the second count value equaling a predetermined value,” as recited by amended claim 1 (emphasis added). However, in contrast to the recited features of claim 1, MeLampy removes/replaces entries upon the event of an aggregation, that is, upon two or more route entries being combined into one entry. This occurs when multiple routes contain the same base route and have identical attributes (MeLampy, column 45, lines 14-24). Thus, MeLampy does not disclose or suggest using a counter to determine whether or not to replace a table entry, nor does it disclose or suggest replacing a selected entry when the counter is equal to a predetermined value.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Powers, Teague, and MeLampy does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2, 4, and 10-14 depend upon claim 1. As such, and for at least the reasons stated above, Applicants request that those rejections also be withdrawn.

Claim 15 was rejected using the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1. For at least similar reasons as stated above, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 17-18, 20 and 25-28 depend upon claim 15. As such, and for at least similar reasons as stated above, Applicants request that those rejections also be withdrawn.

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powers et al. (US No.: 6,832,086 B1), hereinafter “Powers” in view of Teague (Pub. No.: US 2003/0229717 A1) in view of MeLampy et al. (US 7,002,973 B2), hereinafter “MeLampy” and in further view of Fisherman et al. (US No. 5,586,301), hereinafter “Fisherman”.

Claim 16 depends upon claim 15 and is allowable for at least the reasons stated herein. The addition of Fisherman does not cure the identified deficiencies of Powers, Teague, and MeLampy. As such, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 29-45 have been added and are supported by the specification and claims as originally filed. Claim 29 is supported by at least paragraph 0034. Claims 30-37 and are supported by at least claims 1-14 and paragraph 0053. Claims 38-45 are supported by at least claims 1-28 and paragraphs 0018-0024.

Applicants further submit that new claims 29-45 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. In particular, claim 29 depends from claim 1 which is allowable for at least the reasons stated herein. Claims 30-37 and 38-45 are computer readable medium and apparatus claims, respectively, of claims selected from claims 1-14 and are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons stated herein. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of new claims 29-45.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. **03-1952** referencing docket no. **324212008500**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: October 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Electronic Signature /Ernest Ellenberger/
Ernest L. Ellenberger
Registration No.:56,529
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
(650) 813-5786